

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

TO: : Examiner Eugene Lee
Fax No. : 703-872-9319
FROM : Robert D. Watson, # 45,604
Sandia National Laboratories
(505) 845-3139 (Voice)

SEP 16 2004

Applicant : Peterson
Application No. 09/955,722
Subject: Amendment and RCE
Docket No. : SD-6436.1
Art Unit : 2815
Date : 09/25/2003

Number of Pages (Including Cover Sheet) 17

Legal Notice

This FAX contains information that is legally privileged, company-confidential or proprietary, and/or otherwise exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the addressee, you are warned not to use this information for any purpose, not to make any copies or distributions, and to contact the sender immediately for the proper method of destruction or return of this FAX.

**Application No. 09/955,722
SD-6436.1 S-97675**

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

SEP 16 2004

Application No. 09/955,722
Applicant: Peterson
**Title: Temporary Coating for Protection of Microelectronic Devices
During Packaging**
Filing Date: 09/18/2001
Art Unit 2815
Examiner Eugene Lee
Docket No.: SD-6436.1

**Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450**

September 16, 2004

**Amendment after Advisory Action
and
Request for Continuing Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114**

Dear Sir:

**In response to the Advisory Action of 09/02/2004, applicants submit herein an
Request for Continuing Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114 and an Amendment.**

**Applicants respectfully request that the Office reconsider the patentability of the
invention in light of the arguments and amendments presented herein. Applicants
submit the following in complete response thereto.**

*Application No. 09/955,722
SD-6436.1 S-97675*

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

Claim History

- Claims 1-34 were originally filed on 9/18/2001.
- In the Amendment dated 2/03/2003
 - Claims 31-34 were cancelled in response to a restriction requirement, as being drawn to a non-elected invention;
 - Claims 15 and 16 were cancelled;
 - Claims 1, 10, 17, 19, 25, 28, 29 and 30 were amended; and
 - New claims 35-44 were added.
- In the Amendment after Final dated 8/12/2003:
 - Claim 28 was amended (however, the amendment was not entered by the Office)
- In the Reply to the Advisory Action dated 9/25/2003:
 - The previous amendment to claim 28 was entered.
- A request for continuing examination was filed on 9/25/03, which was accepted. The finality of the previous (Final) Office action was withdrawn.
- In the Amendment filed 02/11/2004, claims 1-44 were cancelled, and new claims 45-60 were added. An amendment to the Specification was presented, but not entered.

Interview with Examiner Lee on 9/15/04

Patent agent R. Watson discussed the most recent Advisory Action with Examiner Lee on 9/15/04. The basic position of Examiner Lee is that *Noordgraaf* teaches a protective coating of parylene on an electronic device, and MEMS devices are a type of electronic device, hence, it would be obvious to put a parylene coating on a MEMS device. I pointed out that the device Applicant is claiming represents a non-functional, intermediate step in the process of fabricating a fully-functional MEMS device.